DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 928 CG 004 934

AUTHOR EPTING, FRANZ R.; AND OTHERS
TITLE SOME ASPECTS OF REVEALINGNESS AND DISCLOSURE: A REVIEW.
INSTITUTION FLORIDA UNIV., GAINESVILLE.
PUB DATE 69
NOTE 28P.

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.50
DESCRIPTORS *BEHAVIOR, *COMMUNICATION (THOUGHT TRANSFER), FANTASY, *LINGUISTIC PATTERNS, RISK, ROLE PLAYING, *SELF CONCEPT, *SPEECH HABITS, TEST CONSTRUCTION, TESTS

ABSTRACT

IN EXTENDING THE CONCEPT OF SELF-DISCLOSURE WHICH IS CONCERNED WITH THE CONTENT OF PERSONAL COMMUNICATION, THE FOCUS OF THIS REVIEW IS ON A PROCESS CONCEPTION OF DISCLOSURE CALLED REVEALINGNESS. REVEALINGNESS DEALS WITH THE COMMUNICATION OF SELF AS MEASURED BY LINGUISTIC STYLE, AND IN SOME CASES, VOICE QUALITY, AS WELL AS THE CONTENT OF THE DISCLOSURE. SEVERAL MEASURES ARE PRESENTED AS WELL AS THE INITIAL RESEARCH IN WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN USED. THE STRUCTURAL RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THESE MEASURES ARE DISCUSSED WITH REGARD TO THEIR RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS. STUDIES INVOLVING (A) ROLE PLAYING TECHNIQUES; (B) FANTASY AND SITUATIONAL MANIPULATIONS; (C) STRUCTURED AND UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEWS ARE REVIEWED. IN ATTEMPTING TO EVOLVE A THEORETICAL CONTEXT FOR INTERPRETING THE RESULTS, THE CONCEPTS OF INTERPERSONAL TRUST AND PERSONAL RISK WERE EVOKED. (AUTHOR)

ED035928

Abstract

In extending the concept of self-disclosure which is concerned with the content of personal communication, the focus of this review is on a process conception of disclosure called revealingness. Revealingness deals with the communication of self as measured by linguistic style, and in some cases, voice quality, as well as the content of the disclosure. Several measures are presented as well as the initial research in which they have been used. The structural relationships among these measures are discussed with regard to their reliability coefficients. Studies involving (a) role playing techniques; (b) fantasy and situational manipulations; (c) structured and unstructured interviews are reviewed. In attempting to evolve a theoretical context for interpreting the results, the concepts of interpersonal trust and personal risk were evoked.

CG004934

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SOME ASPECTS OF REVEALINGNESS AND DISCLOSURE: A REVIEW

Franz R Epting[1], David I. Suchman
University of Florida
Edwin N. Barker
New York, New York

The phrase "self-disclosure" has been used to describe the tendency of a person to communicate information about himself to someone else. As a theoretical construct self-disclosure has been investigated in several quite unique studies by Sidney Jourard and his associates (Jourard, 1959, 1964, 1968). They have undertaken extensive exploration of this construct using a self-report rating scale developed by Jourard and Lasakow (1958). This instrument consists of six categories of personal information or "aspects of self", each of which contains ten statements, so that there are sixty items which can be disclosed. These items are reported by the subject as having been disclosed in differing degrees to five "target" persons.

There has been a great deal of research with this instrument some of which has been reviewed by Jourard (1964, 1968). Self-disclosure has been explored as a predispositional variable (Drag, 1968; Lubin and Harrison, 1964; Query, 1964), as an experimentally manipulated independent variable (Frey, 1967; Powell, 1968; Rubin, 1968) and as a dependent variable (Brodsky, 1964; Fitzgerald, 1963; Jourard, 1958, 1959, 1961). In these studies, emphasis has been placed on the subjects' report of disclosures he has made.

The purpose of the present paper is to present a review of several exploratory studies which depart from previous work in this area. The most significant departure from the earlier concept of self-disclosure is the present authors' emphasis on personal communication as an on-going process. This process conception of communication considers several classes of data in addition to the content of a subject's disclosure to given targets. Variables which contribute to the subject's style of communication are considered in addition to the content of his disclosure. Paralinguistic characteristics of actual verbal productions are treated as data sources in addition to the content which subjects communicate. A conceptual framework is offered which extends from a content-specific definition of personal communication as "disclosure" to a process conception of "revealingness."

This review of research dealing with the process of revealingness will be presented in three sections. The first section will review instruments that were developed to evaluate the process dimension of personal communication. The second section will deal with studies in which these instruments have been employed, and the final section will be concerned with a general discussion and evaluation of the construct.

Instruments

The Quinn Self-Disclosure Questionnaire

Patrick Quinn (1965) developed a self-disclosure questionnaire (SDQ) which was directly derived from the Jourard & Lasakow's (1958) Self-Disclosure Questionnaire. This questionnaire consists of 20 items taken from two categories (personality and body) of Jourard's six category system. In this technique the subject is

asked to respond by circling either a yes or a no as to whether he would be willing to tell a specified individual in a specific situation the material involved in that item.

Quinn felt that Jourard's instrument left several questions unanswered. The first of these was the relationship between the instructions to the subject and the meaning of the self-disclosure score. With the concern that a subject's opportunity to disclose might affect his score, Quinn modified his instructions to read "Would you disclose" as opposed to Jourard's instructions "Have you disclosed" this item. This was an attempt by Quinn to bring the disclosure into the present rather than continue with Jourard's emphasis on past disclosures to significant people. The specific content and the number of items endorsed is utilized as the index of self-disclosure. Overall, the Quinn SDQ is an attempt to measure in a more contemporary fashion the disclosure of high intimacy material to a specific target person, in a specified situation. More recently other investigators have attempted this same type of modification (Weigel, Weigel, & Chadwick, 1969).

The Greene Self-Disclosure Sentence Blank

Ronald Greene (1964) developed a sentence blank technique for measuring self-disclosure entitled the Self-Disclosure Sentence Blank (SDSB). The model used for constructing the instrument was Rotter's Incomplete Sentence Blank (Rotter and Rafferty, 1950). The categories for judging the production to the incomplete sentences was an attempt to refine Hiler's (1954, 1959) category system which was designed to assess willingness to reveal oneself through the use of the Michigan Sentence Completion Test.

The instrument consists of 20 sentence stems that the subject is asked to complete in an open and straight-forward manner. The sentences are judged on a 5 step scale ranging from 1, most revealing, to 5, least revealing. Level one is described as follows: reveals basic feelings of a personal, relevant nature about important aspects of his life; whereas level 5 is described as essentially neutral or evasive material. A judging-by-matching procedure is used where a judge compares each of the 20 sentences with examples in a test manual. The index of revealingness, obtained by summing the levels across the 20 sentences, results in a possible range of scores of 20, most revealing, to 100, least revealing. Greene (1964) reports interjudge reliabilities of .83, .84 and .91. These correlations were obtained by three sets of 2 judges independently scoring separate samples of protocols.

This instrument offers a significant departure from the self-report measures mentioned earlier. A score of disclosure is obtained by judging the actual productions of individuals, i.e., written responses to the sentence stems. In general, statements that reflect the subject's willingness to share socially unacceptable or disapproved materials such as worries and doubts are scored higher than statements of more socially approved materials. It is interesting to note that this scoring procedure is in opposition to Rotter's conception of the scoring of socially unacceptable responses as indicative of psychopathology (Rotter & Rafferty, 1950).

The Revealingness Scale

David Suchmann (1965) developed a scale for the measurement

of revealingness in spoken samples of behavior, entitled the REV scale. Although this scale is similar to Roger's "manner of relating" scale and Gendlin's "experiencing" scale, it was developed to be useful in laboratory and field studies of personal communication (Gendlin & Tomlinson, 1967; Rogers, 1958; Walker, Rablin & Rogers, 1960). Suchman's intent was to develop a scale that would reflect both the content and style of communication during a period of ongoing interaction. Samples of spoken behavior are simulatneously evaluated for language style, voice quality, and content.

The REV scale is designed to produce finer differentiation at the less revealing end of process dimensions than the earlier scales developed by Rogers and his associates. The earlier measures were developed from research in psychotherapy which typically dealt with higher levels of process than those encountered in laboratory or field studies. The focus of convenience intended for the REV scale is one which will overlap with some of the material which might be presented in psychotherapy or a personal interview but which could also be used to codify data from studies in which the subject would not be expected to be communicating at a highly personal level.

The scale consists of six rating categories which have been applied to samples of interview material. The lower levels are described as indicating productions where the person talks about external conditions of the world. The higher levels of revealingness are described as ones in which the subject expresses himself with self-involvement and feeling. He "expresses" himself rather than talking "about" himself. The middle of the scale, serves to separate high revealers from low revealers and is described by a

subject talking about himself without involvement in what he is saying. The person's style is described as intellectualized, mechanical, or distant. Using four judges, Suchman (1965) reported interjudge reliabilities ranging from .53 to .76. With more extensive training of judges Suchman (1966) reported a correlation of .87. All ratings were based on three-minute taped interview segment

The major contribution of this instrument is the attempt it makes to assess and reflect in a single index the disclosure level of an individual by considering what he says in conjunction with the manner in which he makes his production. An item of high intimacy value discussed in a distant and mechanical manner will not be scored as highly as the same content spoken with more references to self. Keller (1966) adapted the scale levels of this instrument for use in judging the written productions of grade school children.

The Personal-Impersonal Rating Scale

The last instrument to be described is one developed by James Carpenter (1966) entitled the Personal-Impersonal Rating Scale. This instrument is designed to assess a dimension with poles labeled personal versus impersonal. This dimension refers to the view or understanding held by one person regarding another. To view or understand another in a personal way is to attribute qualities which are uniquely human in one's description of a person. The person is invested with volitional qualities, thoughts, and actions which are seen to arise from some internal source. In the personal view one offers an anthropomorphic description of the other. The impersonal view of a person describes him in purely objective terms. The description of the individual would

include the types of qualities that could be applied in describing almost any other inanimate or static aspect of the environment. Peripheral and external qualities of the person are emphasized. Treating this dimension as dichotomous, the discrimination made here is simply in terms of which of the two poles applies: the personal or the impersonal pole.

Subjects are asked to write 10 sentences which best describe a designated target person. Through the utilization of the judges manual, each sentence is labelled as personal, impersonal, or unscorable. The numerical index is obtained by dividing the number of personal statements by the number of personal and impersonal statements, and then multiplying this product by 100. This score gives a quotient referred to as the Personal-Impersonal Quotient (PIQ). This is symbolically represented as $PIQ = \frac{P}{P + I} \times 100$. Using three judges, Carpenter (1966) reported inter-judge reliabilities of .59, .76, and .92. In comparing scores obtained from judges with criterion scores, correlations ranged from .55 to .94.

Research Studies

In this section research which has been carried out using the instruments described above is briefly reviewed. Basically, two types of research techniques have been used. The first is the investigation of effects that various fantasy, situational conditions, and role-playing techniques have on revealingness scores. In these studies revealingness is usually a dependent variable. The second group of studies concerns the characterisitcs of the interview which influence revealingness. In these studies revealingness scales have been used for selecting individuals

participating in interviews (independent variables) and as instruments for evaluating the characteristics of the interviews (dependent variables).

The Use of Fantasy, Situational Manipulations, and Role-Playing Techniques

In this section, research is reveiwed in which the subject is asked to consider a person who could fulfill certain role requirements or someone he has actually known who fulfills certain role descriptions. The interest is to assess the communication that the subject presents to the role figure.

Taking the position that personal knowledge of another gives one power, Quinn (1965) investigated how "closeness" of a relationship and personal power in the relationship affect revealingness. In this study he considered three levels of acquaintance (closeness of relationship), and two levels of potential power. Subjects were asked to consider individuals who fulfill the role requirements of a friend, an acquaintance, and a complete stranger. In order to introduce the power variable each of these role figures was then described as either having been invested with high or low control over the subject in an hypothetical situation. Responses to Quinn's questionnaire showed that "friend" was disclosed to most and "stranger" was disclosed to more than "acquaintance."

It was reasoned that a friend is disclosed to at the highest level due to the fact that part of the contractual agreement for friendship is the keeping of information confidential or at least the use of the information in a non-harmful way. The discussion of the finding that "stranger" could be thought of as a safer

target than "acquaintance" followed the folklore description of the person who describes the ease with which he was able to talk to a complete stranger such as a bartender or a stranger on a train. Perhaps this effect is due to the lack of risk involved in this interaction. The acquaintance unlike the stranger, does have some potential for using the information in a selfish manner, and is not obligated to fulfill any contractual agreement for friendship. On the basis of this and other studies reported in this review, Barker (1965) and Suchman (1966) developed a theory of revealingness involving the constructs of emotional risk and personal trust.

Employing a role-playing technique, Greene (1964) had students in English classes enact two role descriptions and then complete the SDSB. One role description pictured a person who could easily express basic thoughts and feelings (the high-revealing role). The other role described a person who does not reveal his basic thoughts and feelings (the low-revealing role). All subjects enacted both roles filling out two SDSBs with the two roles counterbalanced for the total subject pool. Scored in the direction of defensive concealment with a maximum score of 100, the mean for the higher revealing role was 51.55, and the mean for the lower revealing role was 72.40 ($F_{1,16} = 44.96$ $p < .01$). This difference indicates that the sentence completion technique is sensitive to the intentional revealingness of persons completing the blanks.

In further support of the nature of the effect of confidentiality and good intentions of the recipient of a message is a study of the effect of perceived threat on levels of revealingness

(Greene, 1964). In one group (the low-threat group) female subjects were told that the purpose of filling out the sentence blank was to aid the experimenter in refining the instrument, and that their protocol would be kept strictly confidential. In the second group (the high-threat group) they were told that the sentence blank was part of a testing program that was being carried out by the psychology department and that the scores would be made available to their instructors and to the school administration. Consistent with the hypothesized direction of means, the high-threat group had a mean of 64.68 whereas the low-threat group had a mean of 56.05 ($t = 2.83$ $p < .01$).

Investigating the person-perceptual aspect of revealingness using role descriptions, Carpenter (1966) investigated characteristics of human relationships which affect the written PIQ. Carpenter reasoned that persons who occupy central positions in the life of another, and who are regarded with affection should be described by personal rather than impersonal sentences. Groups of undergraduate students read three role-figure descriptions and wrote ten-sentence descriptions of the persons fulfilling the role description. The role-figure descriptions were as follows: 1. A person you know well and to whom you are close (personal friend) 2. Someone you know well but whom you do not like (well-known enemy) 3. Someone whom you like but you don't know very well (like acquaintance). It was hypothesized that the personal friend would be described more personally than the other two figures The personal friend is liked better than the well-known enemy and known better than the liked acquaintance. An arcsign transform was utilized in order to normalize the proportions obtained in

the PIQ index, and a one way analysis of variance was performed.

The role title effect was significant ($F_{2, 78} = 2.78$ $p < .01$). For the well-known friend 29% of the scorable sentences were scored personal. For the liked acquaintance 14% were scored personal, and for the well-known enemy, 11% were scored personal. The only significant difference was between the personal friend and the other two role-figures.

In a second study, Carpenter (1966) studied the relationship between PIQ scores and the communication of target persons. In this study 40 introductory psychology students listened to taped interviews and then wrote ten-sentence descriptions of the persons being interviewed. Two types of interviews were presented and the subjects were given two sets of expectations concerning the reason for listening to the interview. Using the REV scale as a criterion, a high revealing tape and a low revealing tape were selected. The two sets or expectations employed are as follows. In the instrumental set the subjects were told to look for particular qualities of leadership while listening to the tape. In the non-instrumental set subjects were told to try to get a feeling for and get to know the person being interviewed.

As hypothesized the high-revealing interview produced more personal statements than the low revealing interview. This effect was perhaps due to the fact that the person in the high revealing interview was presenting more personal information. In this way the high-revealing nature of the interview let the other person see him in a personal way. Also as hypothesized, the non-instrumental set did produce more personal sentences than the instrumental set. However, as indicated in the significant

interaction, this effect was mainly accomplished by the low revealing group. The percentage of personal sentences was 30 for the non-instrumental set and 31 for the instrumental set for the high revealing group; whereas this percentage for the low revealing group was 19 for non-instrumental and 7 for instrumental.

Interview Research

This section reviews research investigating the variable of revealingness in interview settings. In these studies the various instruments used to assess revealingness have been employed as dependent as well as independent variable measures. As dependent variables revealingness measures have been used to assess the qualities of ongoing interview interaction, and as measures of the reactions of subjects to various aspects of the interview situation after the interviews had been terminated. As independent variables, they have been used as procedures for selecting subjects.

One question that has been posed concerns the relationship between level of revealingness during the interview and the general style or type of interview that is being conducted. Suchman (1965) interviewed 10 introductory psychology students using two interview styles. One type of interview (personal) was described as an interview in which the interviewer tried to get to know the subject as well as possible and enable the subject to trust the interviewer. The other type of interview (impersonal) was described as an interview in which the purpose of the interviewer was to collect factual data about the subject. All subjects received both types of interview and the order of presentation of interview styles was counterbalanced. The interviews were recorded and scored for level of revealingness using the

REV scale. Consistent with the hypotheses in this study, the personal interview style yielded a mean score of 3.50 which was significantly higher than 2.50, the mean score for the impersonal style ($F_{1, 8} = 13.16$ $p < .01$). One possible interpretation is that the trusting manner of the interviewer in the personal interview style produced in the subjects a more open, trusting perception of the relationship, therefore, yielding higher disclosure rates.

In a second study, Suchman (1966) attempted a systematic replication of the interview style manipulation. In this study subjects were preselected using the Quinn SDQ, on the basis of level of disclosure. In addition to assessing level of revealingness with the REV scale, subjects were asked to describe the interviewer using the PIQ, and were asked to rate the quality of interview using the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Lennard, 1959). The results of this study revealed that the interview style effect was replicated. The mean for the personal interview style was 4.04, while the impersonal style yielded a mean of 2.18 ($F_{1, 2} = 22.58$ $p < .001$). It is noted that the mean separation between the two groups is even clearer in this second study. The difference in interview style emerged as a main effect for the two other dependent variables. In the personal interview, the interviewer was described with more personal sentences on the PIQ. The interviewer was also rated as more empathic, congruent, etc., on the Relationship Inventory. The preselection of subjects however, failed to manifest its effects on the dependent variables independent of the other variables.

A study by Greene (1964) examined the relationship between self-disclosure score and psychotherapists' ratings. He found a correspondence between scores on the SDSB and therapists' ratings of the disclosure level of their patients. Thirty male veterans of World War II and the Korean War were assigned to four psychotherapists. The SDSB was completed by these patients as part of the regular testing program of the clinic in which they were being seen for psychotherapy. Their therapists were asked to rate each patient on a five point revealingness scale. Each point on the scale was defined with a brief description ranging from level one (indicating that the patient was revealing aspects of his personal and private world) to level five (indicating that the patient revealed nothing of his inner life). The data for all four therapists combined yielded a correlation between the SDSB scores and the rating scale of $r = .47$, $p < .01$, $n = 30$. With one of the four therapists excluded the correlation was boosted to $r = .64$, $p < .01$, $n = 17$.

Further investigation of revealingness in the interview context was carried out by Haggerty (1964). Utilizing the SDSB as a preselection instrument, females from an undergraduate psychology course were divided into high, medium, and low groups. Following this, 37 of the females were subsequently interviewed by the experimenter. The stated purpose of the interview was for the subject to help the experimenter understand personal interactions. The interviews were recorded for REV scale scoring and the subjects were asked to complete a modified form of Jourard's self-disclosure questionnaire requiring only one target: their best friend. The subjects also completed a relationship inventory

concerning how much they felt understood by the interviewer and the interviewer filled out a reverse form of this inventory concerning how much she felt that she understood the interviewees. Finally, the friend who was designated as the target on the self-disclosure questionnaire was asked to fill out the questionnaire in a manner that would indicate what items the subject had actually revealed to her.

Haggerty found a significant difference between her three SDSB groups. The high SDSB group yielded a mean of 3.91 on the REV scale which was significantly different from the median SDSB group with a mean of 2.87 ($t = 2.60$ $p < .01$). The high SDSB group was also significantly different from the low SDSB group which had a mean of 3.18 ($t = 2.16$ $p < .05$). No differences were found between the low and medium groups. The interviewees' rating of the quality of their relationship with the interviewer was not related to their SDSB scores, but it is interesting to note that the interviewer expressed the impression that she felt that she understood the interviewees in the high SDSB group more than the medium SDSBs and that she felt that she understood the low SDSBs least of all. Perhaps as Carpenter (1966) noted, high self-disclosing subjects can be seen more personally.

In summary, this study seems to give further information to support the fact that the SDSB is a meaningful selection device for subject's predispositions on the revealingness dimension. In addition it is interesting to note that the friends' form of the Jourard SDQ and the subjects rating on that instrument correlated +.36, $p < .05$, $n = 37$. There is some indication that the self-reported disclosures do tend to be corroborated. More

recently, Skypeck (1967) using grade school children as subjects, and Swenson et.al. (1968) using married couples, have also reported evidence to support this corroboration.

In an attempt to evaluate the revealingness pattern of peer interactions in an interview situation, McLaughlin (1965) executed a study in which both the interviewer and the interviewee were selected from a subject pool. In a procedure similar to that employed by Haggerty (1964) she selected female subjects with the 10 highest and 10 lowest SDSB scores from a subject pool of 194 students. These subjects were then interviewed by the experimenter and REV scale scores were determined. From each of these two groups of ten, three subjects were selected on the basis of their REV scale scores. This resulted then in three high-revealing Ss and three low-revealing Ss selected by the SDSB as well as the REV scale. These six Ss were McLaughlin's student interviewees. From the remaining subject pool, those subjects receiving the 25 highest and the 25 lowest scores on the SDSB were selected for the two interviewee groups. This procedure resulted in a 2 x 2 design; high and low interviewers, and high and low interviewees selected on the basis of revealingness scores.

At the end of the actual interviews which were concerned with the general nature of college life, the interviewees were asked to complete the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory and the PIQ rating scale. The interviews were also recorded and revealingness scores were determined. On the basis of the REV scale scores the results indicated there was no difference in either interviewee or the interviewer characteristics. Failing to reach a significant difference, the mean REV score for the high SDSB

interviewees was 2.73, while the low interviewees yielded a mean of 2.75 ($F_{1, 32} < 1$ ns). The difference was similarly non-significant for the two types of interviewers with high interviewers yielding a mean of 2.82, and low interviewers yielding a mean of 2.62 ($F_{1, 32} < 1$ ns). In inspecting these scores it appears that the upper levels of the REV scale were never reached in this study.

It is possible that this failure indicates that more attention needs to be focused on controlling the interview situation in order to get effective discriminations of the REV scale. Another factor that may have contributed to the failure to find significant differences here is that by selecting her most extreme Ss as interviewers McLaughlin eliminated extremely high and low SDSB subjects before selecting interviewees. This truncation of the distribution could have been a factor in failing to reproduce Haggerty's (1964) significant differences between SDSB levels. This pattern of results was also true for the scores on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. In line with these comments, it is noted that Jourard and Resnick (1969) found differences in openness between high and low disclosers in an interview situation. Their interviews were highly structured and the selection of subjects was from the extremes of a large tested population.

In examining PIQ ratings, however, McLaughlin did find a significant difference between the two types of interviewers. For the high revealing interviewers, 29% of the sentences were judged as personal, whereas the low revealing interviewers had only 15% of the sentences written about them judged as personal ($t = 1.86$ $p < .05$). In summary then, it is noted that although

the interviewers were not rated differentially by the REV scale there was a perceived difference in terms of how personally they were rated on the PIQ rating scale.

The last study to be discussed in this section is one carried out by Mellers (1965) on self-disclosure and perception of parents. Mellers selected subjects on the basis of their SDSB scores constituting low, medium, and high disclosure groups. She required subjects to fill out a parent evaluation scale designed to test the subjects' perception of their parents as either positive or negative (Cooper and Lewis, 1962). Through interviews concerning the happiest and saddest experiences in their childhood, subjects were scored for level of revealingness utilizing the REV scale. Mellers hypothesized that high revealing subjects would be more open to all experiences, (both positive and negative) and would <u>report</u> more negative evaluation of both parents. She reasoned that the high revealing subjects would have had the most positive childhood experiences but would be least defensive about reporting negative experiences. The results of this study indicated no significant differences between the three SDSB groups in terms of their total parent evaluation questionnaires. However, opposite to prediction, she found a significant negative correlation between the parent evaluation questionnaire and the REV scale scores, ($r = -.39$ $p < .05$ $n = 43$). The high revealing subjects reported <u>more</u> positive parental perceptions. This finding is consistent with a recent study carried out by Vargas (1969) who reports a significant positive relationship between reported positive childhood experiences and rated level of self-disclosure during a short interview. This relationship

also held when the Jourard SDQ was used to assess disclosure.

Discussion and Conclusions

The measures which have been presented are a self-report questionnaire (Quinn SDQ), an incomplete sentence blank scored for self-disclosure (SDSB), the personal-impersonal quotient (PIQ), and a process scale for revealingness (REV scale). All of these measures and Jourard's self-disclosure questionnaire measure aspects of revealingness. Their structural differences reflect the intention of the authors to broaden the range of situations in which revealingness can be studied. Although the Quinn SDQ retained the self-report format of Jourard's original instrument, an attempt was made to focus the reporting of disclosure on the here and now. In contrast to these self report procedures the SDSB and the PIQ derive scores from subjects by asking them to produce a written response which is then evaluated. Attention is focused on the subject's written production. Ratings are made of the subject's actual presentations rather than his self-report of former presentations to various targets. The REV scale is used for rating the spoken behavior of the subject. Paralinguistic variables are considered in addition to the criteria of the written SDSB and PIQ. The focus is on the communication of the subject in a verbal interaction. The REV scale is more closely related to the SDSB and the PIQ than to Quinn's and Jourard's self-disclosure questionnaires since the events to be considered are actual verbal productions rather than reports of what aspects of self have been or are available for self-disclosure.

The only systematic investigation of the relationships among these instruments was performed by Haggerty (1964). Using a

sample of 15 female subjects she reports a significant correlation between the REV scale and the SDSB ($r = .54$ $p < .01$). The REV scale and the SDSB, however, did not correlate significantly with the simplified Jourard SDQ employed in this study ($r = .15$, ns; and $r = .30$, ns). While this pattern of intercorrelations is consistent with the previous discussion of the relationships among these instruments, it is only a fragment of the full intercorrelational matrix for the five instruments being discussed. Other studies in this area have reported only isolated correlations between pairs of instruments. An investigation of the total matrix of intercorrelations is presently being undertaken by the authors in order to empirically assess the structural and conceptual relationships existing among these instruments.

Consistency and Reliability

Another dimension on which all five instruments can be compared is the amount of constraint which the instrument places on the subject's responses. This is a function of the degree of structure of the instrument. In examining the five instruments it is apparent that the self-disclosure questionnaires are the most highly structured, asking subjects to place numerical ratings in the cells of a grid. The SDSB is more structured than the remaining measures and asks the subject to complete a series of sentence stems. The PIQ constrains the subject less than the previous measures by simply asking for sentences which will describe a selected target. The least constraint is placed on the subject by the REV scale since verbal productions in an interview are the samples of behavior to be rated. The structure, or lack of it, in the instruments and the resulting constraints

placed upon subjects, produces differing degrees of complexity involved in the judgments to be made by raters in deriving scores from these instruments. The REV scale, at one end of this dimension of structure, places little or no constraint on the subject. The judge is required to assign a rating based on all of the subject's verbalizations in an interview sample. For the self-disclosure questionnaires, at the other end of this dimension, a self-disclosure score can be obtained by simply adding the ratings which the subjects themselves have provided for each item. In order to expand from the construct of self-disclosure to revealingness, it is necessary to make judgements about more complex classes of behavior. This increase in complexity is reflected in a progressive decrease in the reliabilities of the revealingness measures. Presented in the order of their complexity, the median of the interjudge reliability coefficients reported for the three more complex instruments is as follows: REV md.r = .56, PIQ md.r. = .76, SDSB md.r. = .84. These are compared to the odd-even reliability of the less complex and more highly structured Jourard SDQ r = .94. It appears then that reliability coefficients tend to decrease as the measures place less constraint on the subject.

However, it is important to note that experimenters have reported much higher correlations approximating r = .90 by careful training of judges, and the refining of rating categories (Suchman, 1966). Training sessions in which prospective raters discuss the rating categories and practice using the rating scales is required for adequate reliability. This extra time spent

in training is the price which must be paid for the use of complex process instruments.

Research Studies

Studies employing fantasy and role playing techniques provide a demonstration of the sensitivity of the revealingness instruments to situational manipulation. The affective nature of a relationship as well as the level of acquaintance have been shown to influence revealingness scores. Perceived intentions of another and expectations involved in a relationship were also effective in altering these scores. Woven throughout these studies are the variables of interpersonal trust and personal risk in determining the nature of a relationship. The studies have provided a beginning to the experimental explication of the influence of these variables on revealingness.

The detectable operations of revealingness as a variable were most subtle in the interview studies. One of the clearest effects was the influence of interview style on the level of revealingness in the interview. This effect seemed to be enhanced by structuring the interview and insuring the consistency of the particular interview style. Most notably these studies provided the initial steps for investigating specific qualities of interviews outside the psychotherapeutic setting. It is on this basis that these studies may provide an impetus for further research.

In summary, the purpose of this review is to acquaint the reader with the conceptual dimension dealing with the complex of processes called revealingness. Through these studies data has been obtained about a process which had not been accessable to experimental analysis previously.

References

Barker, E. N. Humanistic psychology and scientific method. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Humanistic Psychology, Chicago, September 1965.

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. The relationship inventory: A technique for measuring therapeutic dimensions of an interpersonal relationship. Unpublished manuscript based on Dimensions of perceived therapist response related to therapeutic change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959.

Brodsky, S. L. Self-disclosure in dormitory residents who seek counseling. Psychology, 1964, 1, 12-14.

Carpenter, J. C. The construct personal-impersonal. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1966.

Cooper, J. B., & Lewis, H. H. Parent evaluation as related to social ideology and academic achievement. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1962, 101, 135-143.

Drag, L. R. Experimenter-subject interaction: A situational determinant of differential levels of self-disclosure. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Florida, 1968.

Fitzgerald, M. P. Self-disclosure and expressed self-esteem, social distance, and areas of the self revealed. Journal of Psychology, 1963, 56, 405-412.

Frey, M. The effects of self-disclosure and social reinforcement on performance in paired-associate learning. Unpublished senior honors paper, University of Florida, 1967.

Gendlin, E. T. Experiencing and the creation of meaning. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Gendlin, E. T. & Tomlinson, T. M. A scale for the rating of experiencing. In C. R. Rogers, E. T. Gendlin, D. J. Kiesler, & C. B. Truax (Eds.), The therapeutic relationship and its impact. Madison, Wisconson: University of Wisconson Press, 1967. Pp. 589-592.

Greene, R. A sentence completion procedure for measuring self-disclosure. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1964.

Haggerty, P. A. The concept of self-disclosure. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1964.

Hiler, E. W. An investigation of psychological factors associated with premature termination of psychotherapy. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1954. No. 7660.

Hiler, E. W. The sentence completion test as a prediction of continuation in psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology 1959, 23, 544-549.

Jourard, S. M. A study of self-disclosure. Scientific American, 1958, 198, 77-82.

Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure and other-cathexis. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 428-431.

Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure patterns in British and American college females. Journal of Social Psychology, 1961, 54, 315-320.

Jourard, S. M. The transparent self. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Jourard, S. M. Disclosing man to himself. Princeton: Van Nostrand 1968.

Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 91-98.

Jourard, S. M., & Resnick, J. L. The effects of high revealing subjects on the self-disclosure of low revealing subjects. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, 1969.

Keller, J. L. A study of self-revealingness in children's written communication. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1966.

Lubin, B., & Harrison, R. L. Predicting small group behavior with the self-disclosure inventory. Psychological Reports, 15, 77-78.

McLaughlin, H. G. Interpersonal effects of self-disclosure. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1965.

Mellers, A. E. Self-disclosing and the perception of parents. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1965.

Powell, W. J., Jr. Differential effectiveness of interviewer interventions in an experimental interview. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 210-215.

Query, W. T. Self-disclosure as a variable in group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1964, 14, 107-115

Quinn, P. T. Self-disclosure as a function of degree of acquaintance and potential power. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1965.

Rogers, C. R. A process conception of psychotherapy. American Psychologist, 1958, 13, 142-149.

Rotter, J. B., & Rafferty, J. E. Manual for Rotter Incomplete Sentence Blank: College form. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1950.

Rubin, J. E. Impression change as a function of level of self-disclosure. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Florida, 1968.

Skypeck, G. Self-disclosure in children, ages six through twelve. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Florida, 1967.

Suchman, D. I. A scale for the measure of self-disclosure in spoken behavior. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1965.

Suchman, D. I. Responses of subjects to two types of interviews. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1966. No. 67-2548.

Swenson, C. H. Jr., Shapiro, A., & Gilner, F. The validity of Jourard's Self-Disclosure Scale. Unpublished manuscript, Purdue University, 1968.

Vargas, R. A study of certain personality characteristics of male college students who report frequent positive experiencing and behaving. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, February 1969.

Walker, A. M., Rablin, R. A., & Rogers, C. R. Development of a scale to measure process change in psychotherapy. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1960, 16, 79-85.

Weigel, R. G., Weigel, V. M., & Chadwick, P. C. Reported and projected self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 283-287.

Footnote

[1]Requests for reprints should be sent to Franz R. Epting, Department of Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601.